

## REMARKS

The objection to the specification and the Section 112 objections to claims 3, 8-10, 27, and 29-30, set forth in paragraph 6 of the office action have been corrected.

The objection set forth in claim 4 appears to be simply an objection that the claim is broader than the specific embodiment in the specification. Reconsideration is requested since there is no basis for making such an objection. The first paragraph objection cannot be an enablement objection because if the specification enables the narrower disclosure, it most certainly enables the broader claim.

A terminal disclaimer is attached.


As amended, the claims distinguish over O'Connor since in O'Connor, the sensor does not move with the button.

In Sayag, everything moves with everything, because it is an integral unit. However, the claim is clear that the button moves relative to the housing and the sensor moves with the button relative to the housing.

Therefore, the claims as amended patentably distinguish over the art of record and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]